

CHRISTER PLATZACK

Germanic Verb Second Languages

Attract vs. Repel: On Optionality, A-bar Movement and the Symmetrical/Asymmetrical Verb Second Hypothesis*

Abstract

Im 'Minimalistischen Programm' (Chomsky 1995) werden A-Bewegungen ('A-movements', d.h. N-Hebung, V-Hebung usw.) und A'-Bewegungen ('A-bar-movements', d.h. Extraposition, VP-Adjunktion, 'scrambling' usw.) als sehr ungleichwertige Operationen behandelt. Der vorliegende Aufsatz untersucht die distinkten Eigenschaften von A-Bewegungen und A'-Bewegungen anhand von drei Gruppen von Argumenten, nämlich Topikalisierung (Abschnitt 2), Verschiebung schwacher Pronomina (Abschnitt 3) und Verb-Zweit unter der Symmetrie-Annahme (Abschnitt 4). Die Konklusionen daraus sind, daß die hier vertretene Analyse eine Möglichkeit bietet, A-Bewegungen und A'-Bewegungen zu unterscheiden, ohne letztere aus dem Zuständigkeitsbereich der Grammatik zu verbannen.

1. Introduction

Within the Minimalist program (Chomsky 1995) movement is taken to be attraction of features by corresponding features in functional categories. This theory offers profound prospects for describing the core computational properties of the language faculty like V-raising and N-raising, agreement, and generally the kind of processes subsumed under A-movement. The behavior of operations like extraposition, right-node raising, VP-adjunction, scrambling and other types of A-bar-movements are not readily incorporated, however. Chomsky (1995, ch. 4, section 7.3.) even

* Der Aufsatz greift in die aktuelle Diskussion innerhalb des 'Minimalistischen Programms' ein und kann daher u.a. auch als günstiger Einstieg in die Hintergrundliteratur und die metaphernreiche Terminologie dieser Modellversion dienen. Wir haben uns daher entschlossen, den englischen Originaltext des Tagungsvortrags beizubehalten. (Anmerkung der Herausgeber)

In preparing this paper I have benefitted from discussions with Lars-Olof Delsing, Cecilia Falk, Gunlög Josefsson and Inger Rosengren. I have also got valuable comments by the audience of a workshop organized in August 1994 held in honour of professor Inger Rosengren, as well as by the audiences of the 10th Comparative Germanic Syntax workshop in Brussels, January 1995, and the conference Grammar in Focus, Lund University, February 1995. The usual disclaimers apply, of course.

suggests that such rearrangements are not the subject-matter of the Minimalist program.

It is undeniable that A-movement and A-bar-movement have different properties. Whereas A-movement is local in nature (it is commonly assumed that no instance of A-movement can cross the boundary of a tensed clause, for instance), no such restriction holds in general for A-bar-movement. Furthermore, as is evident from the success of the Relativized Minimality condition of Rizzi (1990), these two types of movement result in different types of chains. However, to exclude the study of A-bar movement from grammar proper (i.e. saying that A-bar movement is not explicable in terms of the computational system of the I-grammar) seems to me to be an unnecessarily drastic way to handle a problematic set of cases.

In this paper I will defend the thesis that there is a theoretically based difference between A-movement and A-bar-movement, which is the basis for the different properties of these two types of movement. Whereas I will follow Chomsky (1995) in describing A-movement as the result of Attract F, where F is an abstract feature, I will claim that A-bar movement should be described as Repel F. Attraction takes place in order to check features, covertly if the attracting feature is weak, overtly otherwise (pied piping the phrase associated with the attracted feature in the latter case). Repel F, on the other hand, is not a case of feature checking. Assuming theoretically that any element in the clause can be marked [Repel F], this element is forced to move out of the domain hosting F (the maximal projection of the functional head containing F). Repel F must presumably always be applied prior to Spell-Out.

I will provide three sets of arguments for the proposed distinction between A-movement and A-bar movement. In section two I will demonstrate that, applied to Topicalization, my approach has several virtues compared to a checking account. Section three is about a more local instance of A-bar-movement, the displacement of weak pronouns: as will be shown, an analysis in terms of Repel F seems preferable in such cases as well.¹

¹ There is no consensus today regarding the status of pronoun displacement; with respect to Scandinavian Object Shift (see section 3 below), the movement involved has been claimed to be A-movement, A-bar-movement, Head movement or PF-movement. See Holmberg/Platzack (1995, p. 145ff.) for an overview. Unless there is a one-to-one relation between Attract/Repel and type of movement, the exact classification of the movement involved in pronoun displacement has no consequences for my discussion.

Finally, in section four, I will approach verb second, demonstrating that the Repel-analyses of Topicalization and weak pronouns favour the symmetrical verb second hypothesis (the finite verb always moves to C') over the asymmetrical one (the finite verb is in Agrs' in subject first clauses, in C' otherwise). In section five I conclude that although the approach taken here can be seen as uneconomical, introducing another reason for movement in addition to attraction, it has certain virtues due to offering a possibility to keep A-movement and A-bar-movement apart without having to take the drastic step of expelling A-bar-movement from grammar proper.

2. Topicalization

2.1 Introduction

In this section I will claim that Topicalization is triggered by the presence of a feature incompatible at Spell-Out with the highest A-projection; for convenience I will simply call this feature "A". Prior to Spell-Out, an element marked [Repel A] must move to the first available node outside the highest A-position.

From a functional perspective, Topicalization can be described in terms of dichotomies like Theme-Rheme, Topic-Comment, Focus-Presupposition, or Given-New; how to interpret the division of a particular sentence is determined by the context. From the point of view of grammar, the interpretation of the fronting in terms of information structure is less salient compared to the fronting *per se*: whatever contextual reason we may find to front a phrase, grammar must provide us with the possibility to perform such a fronting. This is accomplished if we assume that a marker [Repel A] may be added to any one of the phrases within the clause. The description of Topicalization in terms of Repel A is outlined in 2.2. Subsection 2.3 is about Narrative Inversion, and subsection 2.4 about Topic-Drop, both constructions being of importance for the comparison of my account of Topicalization with approaches in terms of attraction.

2.2 Topicalization as a result of [Repel A]

According to the theory presented here, the German sentence (1), where the direct object is topicalized, is derived as outlined in (2):

- (1) Dieses Buch las er gerne.
 (2) [CP [C^{*} las] [AgrsP er dieses Buch gerne]] →
 [Repel A]

[CP dieses Buch_i [C^{*} las] [AgrsP er t_i gerne]]

The direct object *dieses Buch* 'this book' is marked [Repel A]. Hence, this phrase must be moved out of the domain of A-positions prior to Spell-Out. Taking the highest A-position to be AgrsP, the phrase marked [Repel A] must move to the first available position in front of AgrsP; a restriction like Shortest Movement prevents the phrase to move anywhere else. In a structure like (3), where the finite verb has moved to C^{*}, Spec-CP is available as a landing site for the repelled phrase.

Alternatively, we may envisage the possibility that the finite verb is still in Agrs^{*}, as in (4), i.e. its finiteness feature has not yet been checked:

- (3) [AgrsP er las....dieses Buch]
 [Repel A]

In this case there is no C-projection, and as a consequence there is no available landing site for the repelled phrase.² A theoretical possibility in such a case is to generate an empty functional head in front of AgrsP: let us call this head μ^* , following a suggestion by Johnson (1991). Spec- μ P would then be available for the repelled phrase, as illustrated in (4):

- (4) [μ P dieses Buch_i [μ^* e] [AgrsP er las ...t_i]]

Verb second apparently forces verb movement to μ^* . However, since μ^* does not carry any features of its own, it cannot attract the verb. Only if the verb is attracted by a higher head does it have to pass through μ^* . In a framework assuming a symmetrical analysis of verb second, according to which C^{*} hosts a strong finiteness feature to be checked against a corresponding feature of the finite verb (see section four below)³, the presence of a finite verb in the structure forces the generation of CP. Hence, also when (4) is generated to provide a landing site for the repelled phrase, a C-projection must be created on top of

² Following Kayne (1994) I take adjunction to a phrase with a specifier to be impossible, hence the phrase to be topicalized cannot adjoin to AgrsP.

³ Another possible way is to lexicalize the strong finiteness feature in C^{*} with an expletive complementizer like *that*, see Law (1991) for such a suggestion. Taking lexicalization to make strong features weak (see Groat 1995), the raising of the finite verb to C^{*} is now postponed till after PF.

μP , giving us (5), where the verb has moved from Agrs^* to C^* in order to check the finiteness feature:

- (5) $[\text{CP} [\text{C}^* \text{ las}_v] \mu P \text{ dieses Buch}_i [\mu^* t_v] [\text{AgrsP er } t_v \dots t_i \text{ gerne}]]$

This derivation is ruled out by economy principles. The structure in (5) was created in order to take care of both the finiteness feature of the verb, and the marking of *dieses Buch* with [Repel A]. However, the structure given in (2) offers a more efficient way to perform the same things, hence (5) is a less economical description, and consequently must be blocked. It is in accordance with this account that the word order of (5) is ungrammatical:

- (6) * *Las dieses Buch er gerne.*

The description of Topicalization just outlined directly accounts for the absence of embedded clauses introduced by Topic + *that*. The domain to escape by a phrase marked [Repel A] must be the one delimited by the highest A-position, blocking cases like Swedish (7).

- (7) **Han beklagade [aldrig att han kommer hit].*
'he regretted never that he comes here'

Note that my account predicts that Topic + *that* is possible in case we have a *that*-clause which is independently used. In Swedish, *that*-clauses can be used without any matrix as exclamations: it is in accordance with my description that Topicalization is possible in such cases, see (8) below:

- (8) *Aldrig att han kommer hit!*
'never that he comes here'

In the next subsection I will discuss Narrative Inversion, a construction which might be problematic for a description where Topicalization is the result of overt attraction of a strong feature.

2.3 Narrative Inversion

A description where Topicalization is triggered by a strong Topic feature in C^* has problems explaining why cases like (7) are bad. If Topicalization is an instance of Attract F, (see Zwart 1993, p. 243 and Wilder/Cavar 1994, p. 69 for checking accounts compatible with such a description) there must be a feature in C^* which attracts a feature in the fronted element. Following standard procedures within the Minimalist program, this feature should be strong or weak, i.e. languages would potentially differ with respect to overt Topicalization. It has been taken as a defining feature of verb second languages that there must be some

element in front of the finite verb, hence presumably there is a strong Topic feature in C* in these languages. Under this scenario the presence of a construction like Narrative Inversion is problematic, since it is not obvious that this construction involves any movement. The Dutch example in (9) is taken from Zwart (1993, p. 201):⁴

- (9) 1. Afijn, ik naar die vent toe (Zwart 1993, p. 201):
 'so I to that guy went. PRT'
 2. Begint-ie me toch een verhaal op te hangen
 'starts-he me MODAL a story on to hang'
 So I went over to this guy, and he starts to tell me a
 (crazy) story
 (you would not believe it)

Zwart (1993, p. 201-205) claims that the finite verb in main clauses is in C* in V2-languages except in subject first clauses, where it is in Agrs*, immediately following the subject in Spec-AgrsP (the asymmetrical hypothesis of verb second, see section 4). This analysis predicts (Zwart 1993, p. 202) that there is a triggering element in Spec-CP in cases of Narrative Inversion – otherwise the theory must be supplemented with the *ad hoc* assumption that C* hosts a particular strong V-feature only in this construction. To avoid such a construction particular solution, Zwart describes Narrative Inversion as containing an empty operator in Spec-CP. Elaborating upon a suggestion by Cardinaletti (1990) regarding Topic-Drop, Zwart furthermore assumes this operator to bind a pronominal variable. Just like the empty operator in the Topic-Drop constructions, this operator is assumed to indicate contiguity.

Whereas the operator analysis is the only natural one given the asymmetrical V2 hypothesis of Zwart (1993), the symmetrical V2 hypothesis and the approach to Topicalization in terms of [Repel A], that I am advocating here, clearly favour an analysis where there is nothing in front of C* in Narrative Inversion constructions: Narrative Inversion is what we get in main clauses when there is no element marked [Repel A]. According to the symmetrical V2 hypothesis, there is always a strong V-feature in C*, hence fronting of the verb in the absence of something in Spec-CP is in no way an *ad hoc* solution in this approach.

⁴ Swedish examples with Narrative Inversion have been discussed e.g. by Platzack (1987) and by Dahlbäck/Vamling (1983), from which the following example is taken:

(i) Så låg han bara där. Kom hon in där, kände han igen henne, började han darra ...
 'then lay he only there. Came she in there, recognized he her, began he to-tremble ...'

argument for assigning Narrative Inversion and Topic-Drop the same structural description may be doubted.

The value of the continuity argument is weakened by the fact that the operator analysis of Topic-Drop does not pertain to all instances of this construction: Cardinaletti (1990) argues that constructions with object Topic-Drop are structured differently compared to constructions with subject Topic-Drop, as illustrated in (13):

- (13) a. Habe ich gestern gekauft.
 b. Op_i habe ich gestern pro_i gekauft.
 c. Habe es gestern gekauft.
 d. pro_i habe t_i es gestern gekauft

Whereas object Topic-Drop involves an operator in Spec-CP binding small *pro*, subject Topic-Drop involves the fronting of small *pro* to Spec-CP (or, given the asymmetrical analysis of Zwart (1993), to Spec-AgrsP).

Zwart's account predicts a certain similarity between Narrative Inversion and cases with object Topic-Drop, whereas no similarity is predicted with respect to subject Topic-Drop. Since both subject Topic-Drop and object Topic-Drop indicate continuity with the preceding context, it is clear that Zwart's observation that Narrative Inversion also indicates such continuity cannot be a strong argument: if Cardinaletti is right there are obviously constructions with a continuity interpretation that do not contain an empty operator in Spec-CP. Hence the economy argument for reducing Narrative Inversion to a subcase of Topic-Drop cannot be considered a strong one.

So far I have tried to show that Zwart's account of Narrative Inversion is not necessarily the correct one. Under my description, there is no need to assume the presence of an empty operator in Spec-CP in Narrative Inversion constructions: as a matter of fact, I claim that there is no Spec-CP in this case. Such a description is possible in a grammar where Topicalization is triggered by [Repel A], as mentioned above, whereas it leads to an *ad hoc* solution in case Topicalization is triggered by a strong feature in C^+ .

Narrative inversion is not the only construction where it seems feasible to assume the lack of Spec-CP: also *that*-clauses are of this type. As mentioned in connection with example (8) above it is a problem for descriptions that assume the obligatory presence of Spec-CP to account for the fact that this position is not an appropriate landing site for topicalized elements in *that*-clauses. In my account, however, the structure of ordinary *that*-clauses and the structure of main clauses with Narrative

Inversion are considered to be identical: both constructions are headed by a specifier-less CP, indicating that neither the main clause with Narrative Inversion, nor the ordinary embedded *that*-clause, has the two-part structure typical of root clauses. Consequently they should have the same pragmatic interpretation in terms of topic-comment, theme-rheme etc. Discussing Narrative Inversion in German, Öttenfors (forthcoming) comes to the conclusion that clauses with Narrative Inversion are emphasizing their full-comment interpretation. It seems to me that the same interpretation can be given to *that*-clauses; to make the comparison as simple as possible, consider the use as exclamatives of the Swedish *att*-clauses in (14):

- (14) a. Att han ska vara så djäkla dum!
 'that he shall be so bloody stupid'
 b. Att han inte kan lugna sig!
 'that he not can calm himself (=calm down)'
 c. Att du alltid ska behöva skrika så!
 'that you always shall have-to shout so'
 d. Att det aldrig kan bli vackert väder!
 'that it never can be nice weather'

As already mentioned in connection with the discussion of (9) above, in such cases there is an alternative construction, in which an adverbial of the embedded clause is repelled:

- (15) a. Inte att han kan lugna sig!
 'not that he can calm down'
 b. Alltid att du ska behöva skrika så!
 'always that you shall have-to shout so'
 c. Aldrig att det kan bli vackert väder!
 'never that it can be nice weather'

My description automatically accounts for the occurrence of examples like (15): in the absence of a matrix clause, an element marked [Repel A] within the *that*-clause must be outside the highest A-projection. Spec-CP is available as a landing site. Note, however, that my description does not explain why only adverbials may be fronted in cases like this.

2.4 Topic-drop as a general fronting of small *pro*

In this subsection I will try to show that Cardinaletti (1990) is not necessarily on the right track when she argues for different analyses of subject and object Topic-Drop. I will provide support for an analysis where both subject and object Topic-Drop are the result of the fronting of small *pro*. Since Cardinaletti (1990) provides good reasons to assume

subject Topic-Drop to be an instance of small *pro* fronting, I will here inspect her arguments for giving another analysis of object Topic-Drop and demonstrate that these arguments are not compelling.

The analysis of object Topic-Drop that I am envisaging is given in (16); compare with Cardinaletti's account in (13b):

(16) *pro*_i habe ich gestern *t*_i gekauft

Such a description would be in line with the analysis of Topicalization that I am advocating here. Contrary to Cardinaletti's proposal, Topic-Drop could then be generalized as involving small *pro* marked [Repel A]. Below I will try to show that the arguments Cardinaletti (1990) gives for distinguishing subject and object Topic-Drop are not water tight.

There are several properties of object Topic-Drop which are captured by both descriptions. Cardinaletti mentions the following ones; for details, see Cardinaletti (1990):

1. No null argument is possible when Spec-CP is filled by another element, either lexical (a topicalized phrase or a *wh*-element), or empty (question-operator). Furthermore, only one null element of this kind is possible per sentence, indicating that there is a single position involved (Spec-CP).⁶
2. Object Topic-Drop obeys island constraints, like other cases of fronting to Spec-CP.⁷
3. Only NPs are possible to drop, although movement to Spec-CP is not restricted to NPs. Since small *pro* is an NP, not a PP, for instance, this fact is compatible with the small *pro* analysis of object Topic-Drop.⁸

⁶ Compare (ia) with (ib), both examples are taken from Cardinaletti 1990, (her examples (2a) and (3a)):

(i) a. Habe ich gestern gekauft.
b. *Gestern habe ich gekauft. (OK: Gestern habe ich es gekauft.)

⁷ Consider the following example violating Complex NP Constraint (Cardinaletti 1990, her example (8a)).

(i) *Glaube ich an die Möglichkeit zu sehen.

⁸ The following illustration is taken from Cardinaletti (1990, p. 79):

(i) Speaker A: Hast du auf Hans gewartet?
Speaker B: *Habe ich lange gewartet.
(OK: Auf ihn habe ich lange gewartet.)

4. The null object cannot be coreferential with the subject of the clause, i.e. there seems to be a kind of strong cross over effect.⁹

5. Object Topic-Drop allows parasitic gaps.¹⁰

Let us now turn to the properties of object Topic-Drop that according to Cardinaletti (1990) are incompatible with the small *pro* approach, and which therefore constitute the basis for her assumption that object Topic-Drop is structurally different from subject Topic-Drop. Firstly, she notices that whereas successive cyclic *wh*- and XP-movement to Spec-CP are possible, the supposed movement of an empty small *pro* from an embedded clause leads to ungrammaticality (in this presentation, all German examples are from Cardinaletti's paper, unless otherwise stated):

- (17) a. Den Professor_i sagt Hans t_i hat (habe) er t_i gesehen.
b. *Sagt Hans hat (habe) er gesehen.

- (18) a. Den Hans_i glaube ich t_i daß er t_i gesehen hat.
b. *Glaube ich daß er gesehen hat.

Secondly, whereas extraction out of infinitive clauses of overt elements is possible both from a preverbal clause and a postverbal clause, object Topic-Drop is possible only if the infinitive clause is preverbal:

- (19) a. *Habe ich beschlossen zu kaufen.
b. Habe ich zu kaufen beschlossen.

Thirdly, the null object cannot be a pronoun of the 1st and 2nd person; such a restriction is not found with overt fronting:

- (20) Speaker A: Habe ich dich gestört?
Speaker B: Mich hast du sehr gestört.
Speaker B: *Hast du sehr gestört.

These differences between object Topic-Drop and overt fronting to Spec-CP are compelling for the small *pro* hypothesis, but not impossible to overcome. Consider first the fact that not all types of extractions are

⁹ Compare (i) with (ii), both examples taken from Cardinaletti (1990), her examples (20) and (21):

(i) *Liebt er sehr. (ii) *Wen liebt er

¹⁰ The following example has number (22) in Cardinaletti (1990):

(i) a. Habe ich [ohne zu erkennen] gesehen
b. Habe ich [ohne zu kaufen] gelesen

possible. Note that object Topic-Drop in a case like (18b) is possible in other V2-languages. (21) gives a Swedish example:

- (21) Tror jag inte att han känner.
'believe I not that he knows'

Swedish allows two different word orders for constructions like (17a) with overt Topicalization:

- (22) a. Den flickan, sa han, hade han kysst.
'that girl said he had he kissed'
b. Den flickan sa han han hade kysst.
'that girl said he he had kissed'

In (22a), *sa han* 'said he' is clearly parenthetical. (22b) illustrates the case where the complementizer is not visible (complementizer deletion is possible in Swedish in argument clauses). Note that only the word order in (23b) is compatible with object Topic-Drop:

- (23) a. *Sa han hade han kysst.
'said he had he kissed'
b. Sa han han hade kysst.
'said he he had kissed'

The only possible word order in German is the one corresponding to the parenthetical interpretation in Swedish (22a/23a). In these cases, Topic-Drop is impossible in both languages, maybe as a consequence of a restriction on parentheticals that they cannot be sentence initial. It is to be noted that Reis (1994) offers further support for the assumption that cases like (17a) do not involve fronting but parentheticals.

The proposed analysis does not explain why object Topic-Drop out of the *daß*-clause in (18b) is prohibited, and why German differs from Swedish in this respect. However, since extraction out of embedded clauses is more restricted in German than in Swedish, I believe the solution will be found as soon as we understand this restriction properly. Like the restriction illustrated in (19), to which there is no Swedish counterpart, the OV/VO distinction between German and Swedish is probably of importance.

Consider finally the restriction illustrated in (20), showing that the null object in German cannot be a pronoun of 1st or 2nd person. In Swedish, on the other hand, there is no such restriction: the null object can be of any person, see Mönrsjö (1996). Cardinaletti's description cannot account for the Swedish facts, since the operator in Spec-CP in her description is only compatible with 3rd person NPs. The small *pro* analysis,

on the other hand, can account for both the German and the Swedish facts. It is well-known that languages may differ with respect to the possible interpretation of small *pro*: e.g. Frisian and Bavarian only allow null subject small *pro* of 2nd person, and the Swedish dialect Älvdalsmålet only allows null subject small *pro* of 1st plural and 2nd plural. Hence it should be possible to argue for some language particular interpretation of small *pro* to be involved also with respect to object Topic-Drop.

Concluding, the arguments for a distinction between subject and object Topic-Drop presented in Cardinaletti (1990) are not as strong as they may seem to be when only German is taken into consideration. As I have shown, the analysis presented here, with fronting of small *pro* in both subject and object Topic-Drop, is more economical and hence preferable. In addition, this is the natural analysis in a framework where Topicalization is triggered by [Repel A].

3. Weak pronouns

3.1 Introduction

Like Romance and the other Germanic languages, the Scandinavian languages, i.e. Danish, Faroese, Icelandic, Norwegian and Swedish, display the difference between strong and deficient pronouns proposed by Cardinaletti/Starke (1994) and Starke (this volume), deficient pronouns being either weak or clitics. A pronoun is considered strong when it can be conjoined, stressed or modified. Weak pronouns are morphologically identical to strong pronouns but pronounced unstressed; furthermore they cannot be conjoined or modified. The clitic pronouns are morphologically different from the strong pronouns, in addition to not being able to be stressed, conjoined, and/or modified. Compare Swedish *henne* 'her' (3sg fem objective case) which is used both as strong and as weak pronoun (as a weak pronoun it is often pronounced [ənə]), whereas its clitic counterpart is 'na, pronounced [(ə)na], obviously not a phonetically reduced form of *henne*.

According to Cardinaletti/Starke (1994) and Starke (this volume), weak pronouns must occur in a position different from the position of the strong pronouns. Whether or not they are right in claiming that Weak Pronoun Demotion is obligatory will be discussed in section 3.4 below; here it is enough to note the fact that weak pronouns may occur in positions where we do not find strong pronouns or full DPs. I will claim that Weak Pronoun Demotion is triggered by a marker [Repel Case], discussing weak subject pronouns in section 3.2 and weak object pronouns in section 3.3.

It is to be noted that I am not the first one who is envisaging a description of Weak Pronoun Demotion in terms of repelling, although – to the best of my knowledge – no one has used the term *Repel*. Diesing/Jellinek (1993), for instance, argue that Object Shift (the demotion of a weak object pronoun, see section 3.3 below) is movement out of the existential closure of the clause. Similarly, Rosengren (1993) claims that Scrambling involves movement of a phrase out of the Focus domain. Both descriptions have been of importance for the account presented here.

3.2 Subject pronouns

The behavior of Mainland Scandinavian weak subject pronouns in inverted structures indicates that such pronouns occupy a position different from the position taken by DP-subjects and strong subject pronouns. The following Swedish examples show that a weak subject pronoun following the finite verb must be adjacent to the verb, whereas a DP-subject and a strong subject pronoun may be separated from the verb by one or several adverbials. To the best of my knowledge, these facts were first discussed within a generative framework in Platzack (1986, p. 43-46).¹¹

- (24) a. *Har verkligen Kalle* / HAN / *'n gjort det här?
 'has really Kalle / he (strong) / he (weak) done this here'
 b. *Igår köpte inte Erik* / HAN / *'n en ny bil.
 'yesterday bought not Erik / he (strong) / he (weak) a new car'

In embedded clauses, adverbials may occur between the complementizer and a DP-subject or strong subject pronoun, but not between the complementizer and a weak subject pronoun:

- (25) a. *Hon undrade om verkligen Kalle* / HAN / *'n hade köpt boken.
 'she asked if really Kalle / he (strong) / he (weak) had
 bought book-the'
 b. *Det är märkligt att inte Erik* / HAN / *'n
 har köpt en ny bil.
 'it is curious that not Erik / he (strong) / he (weak)
 has bought a new car'

These facts indicate that a weak subject pronoun is not in the same position as a strong subject pronoun or a DP subject. Assuming the latter ones to be in Spec-AgrSP, the weak subject pronoun must be in a higher

¹¹ In the examples I have indicated the weak pronoun with a reduced spelling, 'n for *han* 'he', d'n for *den* 'it' (common gender). In written Swedish, there is no spelling difference between strong and weak personal pronouns, as already mentioned.

position, outside of AgrsP. A way to account for this placement of the weak subject pronoun is to assume a description where the weak subject pronoun is marked [Repel Case]: since AgrsP is the highest functional projection for checking Case, this description forces the weak subject pronoun to move out of AgrsP, presumably to Spec- μ P. See the discussion in section 4.2 below and the introduction of the μ in connection with example (4) above.

3.3 Weak Object Pronouns

A description in terms of [Repel Case] will account for the placement of a weak subject pronoun outside of AgrsP as I have just shown. With respect to weak object pronouns, it is not immediately clear that they are always placed outside of their relevant Case position, i.e. Spec-AgroP. As a matter of fact, Cardinaletti/Starke (1994) claim that weak pronouns actually occupy the Case position, which would mean that a weak object pronoun in VO-languages like the Scandinavian ones are in Spec-AgroP. Since AgroP is outside of NegP in Scandinavian, this description immediately accounts for the observation that weak object pronouns in these languages are in front of the negation at Spell-Out (Object Shift), whereas strong object pronouns and DP objects are left behind the negation at Spell-Out, as illustrated by the Swedish examples in (26):

- (26) a. Han köpte d'n inte.
 'he bought it (weak) not'
 He did not buy it.
 b. *Han köpte DEN / boken inte.
 'he bought it (strong) book-the not'
 c. Han köpte inte DEN / boken.
 'he bought not it (strong) / book-the'
 He did not buy it / the book.

Although I do not have examples which undoubtedly tell us that weak object pronouns in front of the negation are in a position outside of AgroP, there are data pointing in that direction. Consider the Swedish examples in (27), illustrating the position of a weak object pronoun in a case where both sentence adverbials and the negation are involved:¹²

- (27) a. Han köpte d'n förmodligen faktiskt inte.
 'he bought it probably actually not'

¹² Only the word order (27a) is possible in Danish and Norwegian, only Swedish has the full set of possibilities. See Hellan/Platzack (1995) for an overview of the distribution of weak pronouns in Mainland Scandinavian.

- b. Han köpte förmodligen d'n faktiskt inte.
- c. Han köpte förmodligen faktiskt d'n inte.

As these examples show, a weak object pronoun may occur in front of all middle field adverbials, including the negation, or in between such adverbials, the only restriction being that it precedes the negation, which is usually the last one of the adverbials in the middle field (see Holm 1991). Unless we are willing to assume that AgroP may precede not only the negation, but also optionally one or several sentence adverbials, these examples suggest a position for the weak object pronoun outside of AgroP.¹³

With respect to Object Shift, Johnson (1991) has suggested that shifted objects occupy a particular position, i.e. Spec- μ P.¹⁴ I have already introduced the technical possibility to generate an empty μ -projection in section 2.2 above. Let us assume that the μ P involved in Object Shift is localized somewhere between TP and AgroP. As mentioned in 2.2, since μ^* does not carry any features, it cannot attract the verb – only if the verb is attracted to a higher position does it have to go through μ^* , as a consequence of the Shortest Distance requirement.

With μ^* created, its Spec-position may serve as a landing site for the weak object pronoun, which due to its marker [Repel Case] must be outside of AgroP.¹⁵ Hence a description in terms of Repel forces us to assume the possibility to create "empty" phrases like μ P. Note however that such phrases are not allowed unless their heads are filled (by a trace) at Spell-Out.¹⁶ This will explain e.g. why Object Shift is possible only

¹³ The same type of argument can be levelled against the suggestion in Diesing/Jelinek (1993) that the Object Shifted pronoun has moved to an Aspectual node – once again the different word orders illustrated in (48) indicate that the landing site of the pronoun is not a fixed one, hence presumably not determined by some abstract feature of the verb.

¹⁴ Johnson (1991) discusses the status of this projection, suggesting a connection with AgroP, whereas Diesing/Jelinek (1993) suggest that μ P is AspP (aspect phrase); in both cases μ would be an A-position. Although I use Johnson's term, I consider μ to be an A-bar-position.

¹⁵ Another possibility would be to assume that the weak object pronoun cliticizes to μ^* , much in line with the suggestion in Josefsson (1994). Under this analysis, it is unclear why the pronoun cannot raise with the verb to C*, where it would precede the finite verb (assuming Kayne's (1994) restriction that only left adjunction is available).

¹⁶ In section 2.2 I claimed that there may be a phrase μ P between CP and AgrsP, also in embedded clauses. If overt movement through μ^* is a necessary condition for its presence, we have to assume an analysis where the

in case the verb has moved to a higher position; compare (26a) with the Swedish example in (28a), which is ungrammatical:

- (28) a. *Han hade *d'n* inte köpt.
'he had it (weak) not bought'
b. Han hade inte köpt *d'n* /den / boken.
'he had not bought it (weak) /it (strong) /book-the'

3.4 Weak pronouns *in situ*

Weak pronouns undergo Object Shift only when the verb has left VP (or AgroP, actually), see Holmberg (1984, 1986). As a consequence, there is no Object Shift in Mainland Scandinavian in cases with auxiliaries (see (28) above), in embedded clauses, or in control infinitives; the following examples are all Swedish:

- (29) a. *Han kunde henne/det inte förstå.
'he could her / it not understand'
b. Han kunde inte förstå henne / det.
'he could not understand her/ it'
(30) a. *Det är konstigt att han henne /det inte förstod.
'it is peculiar that he her / it not understood'
b. Det är konstigt att han inte förstod henne / det.
'It is peculiar that he did not understand her / it'
(31) a. *Han lovade att den inte läsa.
'he promised to it not read'
b. Han lovade att inte läsa den.
'he promised to not read it'
He promised not to read it.

Note that Object Shift is possible in cases like (30) and (31) in languages like Icelandic, where the tensed verb leaves VP in embedded clauses and the infinitive leaves VP in control infinitives. On the other hand, there is no movement of the main verb in Icelandic in cases with auxiliaries, and consequently Object Shift is blocked in such constructions.

- (32) a. Ég veit að Jón las hana ekki.
'I know that John read her not'
I know that John did not read it.

complementizer is generated in Agrs*, subsequently moved to C* to check the finiteness feature.

- b. Hann lofað i að lesa hana ekki.

'he promised to read her not'

He promised not to read it.

- c. *Jón hefir hana ekki lesið.

John has her not read

- d. Jón hefir ekki lesið hana.

John has not read her

The restriction on Object Shift to contexts where the verb has moved out of VP (AgroP) is somewhat problematic for the account in Cardinaletti/Starke (1994), according to which a deficient (including weak) pronoun cannot occur at Spell-Out in its base position. They are therefore forced to assume some kind of vacuous movement of the object pronouns in cases like (29)-(33). Of course, such a description is possible but – to the best of my knowledge – there is no way to support it empirically.

According to the theory presented above, weak pronouns are marked [Repel Case]. If the presence of this marker is a necessary property of weak pronouns, my description would erroneously predict that the ungrammatical cases of (29)-(33) are well-formed – the pronoun has to repel AgroP at Spell-Out.¹⁷ Consequently, we must assume a weak pronoun to be optionally marked [Repel Case]. In this way the marker [Repel Case] behaves as the marker [Repel A], which is also optional in nature, see section 2 above.

If the option [Repel Case] is picked for cases like (29)-(33), the pronoun is forced to leave AgroP. Creating a μ P outside of AgroP will give us a landing site for the weak object pronoun. However, since there is no overt movement of the verb, the head μ^* will remain empty, leading to a crashed derivation. Since the pronoun cannot remain *in situ*, being marked [Repel Case], there is no way to save the derivation.

In the absence of a Repel-feature, there is no problem: Procrastinate will block the movement of the pronoun prior to Spell-Out, deriving the well-formed cases of (29)-(33) with the weak pronoun *in situ*. Having

¹⁷ Naturally we could envisage some hitherto not mentioned mechanism with the same effect as movement (compare the possibility in many languages to express the focus of a clause either by moving it to a particular Focus position, or prosodically marking it as the focus), but to the best of my knowledge there is no empirical support (at least not any specific prosody) for such a description.

introduced the possibility that weak pronouns do not have to be marked [Repel Case], we predict that also the pronoun in a Swedish example like (34) may be weak:

- (34) *Mannen köpte inte den.*
 'man-the bought not it'
 The man did not buy it.

It has been claimed, e.g. in Holmberg (1986, 1991), that the pronoun in such a case is necessarily interpreted as strong. On the other hand, Josefsson (1994) is of the opinion that the pronoun might be weak: it might e.g. be phonologically reduced, as in (35):

- (35) a. *Han köpte inte'n.*
 'he bought not it (reduced form')
 b. *Han såg inte'na.*
 'he saw not her (reduced form)'¹⁸

If Cardinaletti/Starke (1994, p. 12) are right in claiming that only deficient pronouns may prosodically restructure, the pronouns in (35) must be weak. Hence examples like (35) show that weak pronouns do not have to undergo Object Shift, even in contexts where this is the most natural option.

4. Verb Second

4.1 Introduction

Both within the Principle-and-Parameter approach to syntax and within the Minimalist approach, there are essentially two competing analyses of verb second: the symmetrical analysis, going back to den Besten (1977), the essential claim of which is that the finite verb always goes to C' in main clauses, and the asymmetrical approach of Travis (1984), according to which the verb moves to C' in all cases except in subject-first main clauses, where the CP-level is lacking. The proponents of the symmetrical account have generalized verb movement to C' in all main clauses, but on the other hand they have to provide a special mechanism for getting the subject to the position in front of the finite verb in subject initial clauses. No special mechanism of this kind is needed under the asymmetrical account – however, under this account the finite verb has two different

¹⁸ As mentioned in section 3.1. the form 'na is not a reduced form of the full oblique form *henne* 'her', but a particular weak oblique form, presumably a reduction of the old accusative *hana* 'her', which has been lost in its full form for about 500 years.

Travis' (1984) reason to adopt the asymmetrical analysis of verb second is the existence of a difference between subject-first main clauses and other main clauses in the Germanic V2-languages: neither German nor Dutch accept a weak object pronoun in first position, although a weak subject pronoun is permitted. The relevant opposition is given in (36) and (37):

- As in Dutch, there is a weak/strong opposition in German: replacing *es* with the stressed form *das* makes (37b) grammatical:

(38) Das haben die Kinder gegessen.

Not all pronouns behave the same way. As Vikner/Schwartz (forthcoming) show, there is no morphological difference between the weak and strong forms of e.g. German *er/ihn* 'he/him' and *sie/sie* 'she/her', hence no subject-object asymmetry with these pronouns. The same holds for Scandinavian, where an asymmetry like (36) and (37) is found only with a set of phonetically reduced pronouns. See Vikner/Schwartz (forthcoming) for examples.

It is clear that an asymmetric analysis of V2 elegantly accounts for subject-object asymmetries as the ones illustrated above. Under a symmetrical analysis of V2, there is no obvious reason why such an asymmetry should exist, although it is possible to account for the factual asymmetry in various ways (see Vikner/Schwartz (forthcoming) for a review).

However, since the difference between the symmetric and the asymmetric analyses of verb second is manifested mainly in the different analyses of fronted weak pronouns (see 4.3 for a discussion of some other alleged factual differences between the two approaches), it is obvious that the asymmetrical approach would lose much of its appeal if it is possible to show that this difference follows as a consequence of the nature of the

pronouns, and hence does not necessarily have anything to do with verb second *per se*. The following discussion intends to demonstrate that this is the case.

4.2 The subject-object asymmetry with weak pronouns

The main problem with the symmetrical account of verb second, according to Travis (1984) and Zwart (1993), among others, is the inability, without further proviso, to account for the subject-object asymmetry with respect to fronted weak pronouns: weak subject pronouns, but not weak object pronouns, may introduce the main clause. However, given the analysis of Weak Pronoun Demotion in terms of [Repel Case], as outlined above, and the assumption that weak pronouns cannot be topicalized, i.e. they cannot be marked [Repel A], this factual difference is directly compatible with a symmetrical analysis of verb second. Let us first consider the possibility to front a weak subject pronoun.

Assume the derivation of a main clause where a weak subject pronoun has been overtly attracted to Spec-AgrsP, checking for Case, and the finite verb is in Agrs^{*}, where it has checked for ϕ -features. According to the symmetrical analysis of verb second, the finite verb still has its finiteness feature to check; furthermore, since this feature is checked against the finiteness feature of C^{*}, which is strong in verb second languages, this checking must take place prior to Spell-Out.

There are two possibilities, both of which may provide well-formed derivations. Recall that the weak pronoun, marked [Repel Case], has to get out of AgrsP. Under the first scenario, a phrase μ P is generated on top of AgrsP: remember that this is possible only if the verb is attracted to a higher position, forcing it to pass through μ^* on its way to C^{*}. We now have a landing site for the weak subject pronoun outside of AgrsP, namely Spec- μ P. If the clause contains an element marked [Repel A], this element is moved to Spec-CP, as illustrated above. See the analysis in (39).

(39) [CP das Brot_i [C^{*} hat_v] [μ P es_j t_v [AgrsP t_jt_v ... t_i gegessen]]]

Under the second scenario, there is no μ P on top of AgrsP. In this case AgrsP is the complement of C^{*}. A weak subject pronoun in Spec-AgrsP, marked [Repel Case], has to move to the first available position outside of AgrsP, i.e. Spec-CP, as illustrated in (40):

(40) [CP es_i [[C^{*} hat_v] [AgrsP t_i t_v ... das Brot gegessen]]]

This analysis is compatible with the fact that no other element can be moved to Spec-CP: an example like (41) is not well-formed:¹⁹

(41) *Das Brot es hat gegessen.

Thus under the second scenario, no element of the clause may be marked [Repel A]. As the analysis outlined demonstrates, it is a coincidence that Spec-CP is available both for phrases marked [Repel A] and for phrases marked [Repel Case]. Since there is just one position, only one of these options may be picked for the fronted element. Presumably, weak pronouns cannot be marked [Repel A], hence there is actually only one option.

Consider now the case of weak object pronouns. These pronouns are Case checked in Spec-AgroP, i.e. the marker [Repel Case] forces them to be outside of AgroP. The shortest possible movement is movement to Spec- μ P, as discussed above. There is no way to get from AgroP to Spec-CP by a short move. Hence, there is only one position for weak object pronouns, assuming, as above, that deficient pronouns may not be marked [Repel A]. Consequently, my analysis accounts for the asymmetry with respect to the possibility of fronting weak subject pronouns, and the inability to front weak object pronouns, without giving up the symmetrical analysis of verb second.

4.3 Zwart's arguments for distinguishing between Topicalization and subject first clauses

Whereas I have shown that my analysis in terms of [Repel Case] makes it possible to account for examples like (36) and (37) with the symmetrical hypothesis of verb second, this naturally does not *a priori* disqualify an asymmetric account of verb second: there might be other empirical virtues of this approach. However, the arguments that Zwart (1993) gives for his asymmetric analysis of verb second are not wholly compelling, as the following discussion will show.

According to the asymmetric V2-analysis, subject first V2 sentences are AgrsPs, hence something else than V2-sentences with Topicalization.

¹⁹ The same restriction is found in West Flemish, where clitic *ze* 'she' in first position cannot be preceded by a topicalized phrase. See (i), taken from Haegeman (1991), example (26b):

(i) *Morgen *ze* werkt *zie*.
'tomorrow she (clitic) works she'

See Haegeman for a discussion of the ambivalent status of the clitic pronoun as head or maximal projection. No such ambivalency is needed in the description proposed here.

Zwart (1993, p. 243-254) gives four arguments for this assumption (in addition to the asymmetry between subject and object weak pronouns). The first argument is based on a difference found in Dutch with respect to the 2nd person ending in subject-first clauses and in clauses where something else has been fronted:

(42) a. Jij kent /*ken dat boek.

'you know that book'

b. Dat boek ken /*kent jij.

'that book know you'

That book you know.

According to Zwart, the short form is used when V is in C', as an indication of Agrs-to-C movement. The long form is used otherwise; hence in (42a) with subject-first and only the long form available, the verb is not in C'. A problem for this analysis is why not both endings are possible in (42a): after all, also subjects can be topicalized.

Zwart approaches this problem in Zwart (1993, p. 183, fn. 8), and also in Zwart (1994, p. 31-33). His solution, which is pretty technical, involves a separation of the licensing of the features of the phrase and of the checking of the N-features of the head. As he himself contends, it is not clear whether there is independent support for such extensions of the analysis. Presently, it can be concluded that Zwart has envisaged a way to solve the problem, although the consequences have not yet been investigated. Thus, we can conclude that the argument based on the facts in (42) is at best insufficient.

Zwart's second argument involves examples like (43):

(43) a. Jan kent (*nog altijd) 't niet.

'John knows still always it not'

John (*still) doesn't know it.

b. Toch kent (nog altijd) Jan (*nog altijd) 't niet

'yet knows still always John still always it not'

Yet John still doesn't know it.

The verb and the clitic are adjacent in (43a), and the subject and the clitic are adjacent in (43b). According to Zwart (1993, p. 245), this is accounted for if the subject is in Spec-AgrsP in both cases, whereas the verb is in Agrs' in (43a), in C' in (43b). Under the symmetrical analysis, where the verb moves to C' in both (43a) and (43b), it is not clear, according to Zwart, how the subject can undo the requirement that the verb and the clitic must be adjacent.

There are several things unclear with this argument. First of all it is not obvious where the clitic is situated. From (43b) we can see that adverbials may not intervene between Spec-AgrsP and the clitic, whereas adverbials are allowed between C' and Spec-AgrsP. Under the asymmetrical analysis, (43a) furthermore indicates that adverbials may not intervene between Agrs' and the clitic. I do not understand, frankly, why this should be an argument for the asymmetrical analysis. Furthermore, this argument can be criticized in the same way as the first argument: since subjects may be topicalized, one possible reading of (43a) is that the subject is topicalized, and then there should not be any difference between (43a) and (43b).

Zwart's third argument is actually not an argument. According to Zwart (1993, p. 246), the symmetrical hypothesis predicts that Topicalization should be possible wherever subject placement is possible, given that subject placement and Topicalization are the same processes. He then proceeds to show that Topicalization in embedded clauses is severely limited, compared to subject first embedded clauses. But this is not, as far as I can see, an argument against the symmetrical hypothesis: proponents of symmetric V2 do not claim that the subject is in Spec-CP in embedded clauses – on the contrary, like proponents of asymmetric V2, they assume the subject to be in Spec-AgrsP in ordinary embedded clauses. Hence this argument is a non-argument.

The fourth argument has to do with subject deletion under coordination. Zwart (1993, p. 252) assumes that "an element in the second clause of a coordinate structure can only delete under identity with an element in the first clause if the two elements are in the same structural position". Since the asymmetrical analysis of V2 claims that the subject is in the same structural position when it is clause initial as when it occurs after the verb in inversion, this analysis predicts the correctness of the following four word orders:

- (44) a. *subject* – *finite* – XX and *topic* – *finite* – **subject gap** – YY
 b. *topic* – *finite* – *subject* – XX and **subject gap** – *finite* – YY
 c. *topic* – *finite* – *subject* – XX and
 topic – *finite* – **subject gap** – YY
 d. *subject* – *finite* – XX and **subject gap** – *finite* – YY

The word order of (44d) is correctly predicted to be well-formed also by the symmetrical V2 hypothesis. The word order of (44a), on the other hand, is predicted to be ungrammatical by the symmetrical hypothesis, but well-formed by the asymmetrical one. Surprisingly, Zwart (1993)

does not discuss (44a). However, we immediately note that this word order is impossible in Swedish, as illustrated in (45):

- (45) *Det här tåget fortsätter som intercitytåg till Lund
 'this here train continues as intercity train to Lund
 och sedan stannar _ bara i Eslöv.
 and then stops only in Eslöv'

Hence with respect to (44a), the symmetrical hypothesis, but not the asymmetrical one, makes the correct prediction.

Consider next the word order of (44b), first described in a generative framework by Höhle (1983). This word order is found at least in Dutch, German and Swedish; see also the discussion in Heycock/Kroch (1994):

- (46)
 a. In Mainz fährt Karl abends los und _kommt morgens in Bonn an.
 b. Bagaget satte han ner på golvet och _ sprang direkt till utgången.
 'luggage-the put he down on floor-the and _ ran directly to exit-the'
 He put the luggage on the floor and ran directly to the exit.

In this case, the asymmetrical hypothesis, but not the symmetrical one, appears to make the correct prediction. Note however that there is no indication in these examples of the exact position of the deleted subject in the second conjunct: there could just as well be a gap in the position after the verb as before the verb; if the gap is after the verb we have something similar to Narrative Inversion in the second conjunct. If this is the correct analysis, the occurrence of the structure is predicted by the symmetrical hypothesis.

The fourth word order, illustrated in (44c), is not well-formed in Swedish, as shown by the example in (47). Since the gap is in the same structural position as its antecedent under both the symmetrical and the asymmetrical hypotheses of V2, both hypotheses make the wrong prediction:

- (47) *Igår tog han tåget till Lund och där köpte _ en ny bil.
 'yesterday took he train-the to Lund and there bought _ a new car'
 He took the train to Lund yesterday and bought a new car there.

As the discussion has shown, the observed distribution of subject gaps in coordinations does not seem to provide arguments for either of the two V2-hypotheses. Alternatively, we may doubt the validity of the condition for deletion assumed by Zwart, i.e. that an element in the second conjunct can only delete under identity with an element in the first conjunct if the two elements are in the same structural position.

Concluding, the arguments provided by Zwart (1993) for choosing the asymmetrical analysis of verb second over the symmetrical analysis are at best unclear, and we need more information about various predictions before being able to evaluate them. In the absence of the support of the subject-object asymmetry with respect to initial weak pronouns, I cannot see any good reason to select the asymmetrical analysis over the symmetrical one.

5. Conclusion and discussion

Beginning with the observation that Topicalization is a process that does not fit in nicely with a theory where movement is confined to instances of Attract F (F for feature), I have proposed an alternative account in terms of Repel F: an element marked [Repel A] (A for A-positions) is forced to find a place outside the A-positions, i.e. in front of AgrSP. A similar account may be used for weak pronouns – I claim here that weak pronouns are marked [Repel Case], forcing them to find positions outside of AgroP, and AgrSP, depending on their status as object or subject, respectively.

The analysis of Topicalization as Repel A is compatible with the symmetrical V2-hypothesis, according to which the finite verb always raises to C* in main clauses in V2 languages, presumably attracted by a strong finiteness feature in C*. This hypothesis is indirectly supported by my account of weak pronouns – the strongest argument for the asymmetrical V2-hypothesis is the observation that weak subject pronouns, but not weak object pronouns, may topicalize, which has been taken as indicating a structural difference between main clauses beginning with the subject and main clauses where some other element is in first position. However, given the marking of weak pronouns as [Repel Case], this asymmetry is shown to be a consequence of the nature of these pronouns, hence not an argument for asymmetric V2. As I have attempted to show, also other arguments launched for the asymmetrical V2 hypothesis turn out to be inconclusive. Thus, the present study supports the symmetrical V2 hypothesis over the asymmetrical one.

Concluding, the proposal that A-bar-movement is triggered by a marker [Repel F] attached to some element in the string is an uneconomical description from one point of view, as it introduces a second trigger for movement besides Attract F. However, since A-bar-movement is different in nature from A-movement, attempts to generalize over the two types of movement may well be in error. This is not to say that the approach in terms of Repel F is necessarily the correct one. However, as I have shown in this paper, several seemingly disparate properties of Topicalization

and deficient pronoun demotion are accounted for under the proposed description, supporting the hypothesis that Repel F may actually be an option to be considered seriously. If this approach can be successfully applied also to other constructions containing A-bar-movement, it would offer an alternative to Chomsky's suggestion that several kinds of A-bar-related constructions cannot be accounted for within the computational system.

References

- Cardinaletti, Anna (1990): Subject/object asymmetries in German null-topic constructions and the status of SpecCP. In: Mascaró, J./Nespor, M. (eds.): *Grammar in Progress*. Dordrecht. p. 75-84.
- Cardinaletti, Anna/Starke, Michal (1994): The Typology of Structural Deficiency. On the Three Grammatical Classes. FAS-Papers in Linguistics 1. Berlin 1995, p. 1-55. [to appear also in: van Riemsdijk, Henk (ed.): *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin.]
- Chomsky, Noam (1993): A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory. In: Hale, K./Keyser, S.J. *The View from Building 20. Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*. Cambridge, Mass./London. p.1-52.
- Chomsky, Noam (1995): *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Cinque, Giulio (1990): *Types of A-bar Dependencies*. Cambridge, Mass./London.
- Dahlbäck, H./Vamling, K. (1983): "Tog han då foto" – ett syntaktiskt fenomen i malmötiskt talspråk. Unpublished ms., Department of Linguistics, University of Lund. [Took he then a picture – a syntactic phenomenon in Swedish spoken in the city Malmö]
- den Besten, Hans (1977): On the Interaction of Root Transformations and Lexical Deletive Rules. Ms., MIT and University of Amsterdam. Also published in den Besten (1989), p. 14-100.
- den Besten, Hans (1989): *Studies in West Germanic Syntax*. PhD diss., University of Tilburg.
- Diesing, Molly/Jelinek, E. (1993): The syntax and semantics of Object Shift. (= *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 51).
- Groat, E. (1995): English Expletives: A Minimalist Approach. In: *Linguistic Inquiry* 26, p. 354-365.
- Haegeman, Liliane (1991): Subject clitics and clitic doubling in West Flemish. In: van Riemsdijk, H./Rizzi, L. (eds.): *Clitics and their hosts: EURO TYP Working Papers. Theme group 8: Clitics*. p. 99-154.
- Hellan, Lars/Platzack, Christer (1995): Pronouns in Scandinavian Languages: an Overview. In: *Working Papers in Scandinavian Dyntax* 56, p. 47-69. Forthcoming in: van Riemsdijk, H. (ed.): *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin.
- Heycock, C./Kroch, Anthony (1994): Verb movement and coordination in a dynamic theory of licensing. In: *The Linguistic Review* 11, p. 257-283.

- Höhle, Tilman (1983): Subjektslücken in Koordinationen. Ms., University of Cologne.
- Holm, L. (1991): Satsadverbial eller sättsadverbial? In: Telander, M. et al. (eds.): *Svenskans beskrivning* 18, Lund. p. 172-180. [Sentence adjunct or verbal adjunct?]
- Holmberg, Anders (1984): On certain clitic-like elements in Swedish. In: *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 13, p. 1-31.
- Holmberg, Anders (1986): *Word Order and Syntactic Features in the Scandinavian Languages and English*. PhD Diss., University of Stockholm.
- Holmberg, Anders (1991): The Distribution of Scandinavian Weak Pronouns. In: van Riemsdijk, H./Rizzi, L. (eds.): *Clitics and their hosts*. EUROTYPE Working Papers. Theme group 8: Clitics. p. 155-173.
- Holmberg, Anders/Platzack, Christer (1995): *The Role of Inflection in Scandinavian Syntax*. New York and Oxford.
- Johnson, K. (1991): Object Positions. In: *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 9, p. 577-636.
- Josefsson, Gunlög (1994): Object Shift and Weak Pronouns in Swedish. In: Hellan, L. (ed.): *Clitics in Germanic and Slavic*. EUROTYPE Working Papers. Theme group 8: Clitics. p. 51-82. [also published in *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 49: p. 59-94.]
- Kayne, Richard S. (1994): *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass./London.
- Law, Paul (1991): Verb movement, expletive replacement, and head government. In: *The Linguistic Review* 8, p. 253-285.
- Mörnsjö, M. (1996): *Kontextuell betingad strylening av fundamentalsledet*. [Topic-Drop in Swedish]. Unpublished ms, Department of Scandinavian languages, Lund University.
- Önnerfors, Olaf (forthcoming): On narrative declarative V1-sentences in German. To appear in: Swan, T./Westvik-Jansen, O. *Modality in Germanic Languages*. Proceedings of the IXth Tromsø International Symposium on Language 1993. Berlin.
- Platzack, Christer (1986): The Position of the Finite verb in Swedish. In: Haider, H./Prinzhorn, M. (eds.): *Verb Second Phenomena in Germanic Languages*. Dordrecht. p. 27-47.
- Platzack, Christer (1987): The Case of Narrative Inversion in Swedish and Icelandic. In: *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 31, p. 9-14.
- Platzack, Christer (1994): Syntactic differences in the Comp-domain: Mainland Scandinavian evidence for Split Comp. In: *Glow Newsletter* 32, p. 46-47.
- Reis, Marga (1994): Extractions from Verb-Second Clauses in German? Unpublished ms, University of Tübingen. To appear in: Lutz, U./Pafel, J. (eds.): *On Extraction and Extraposition in German*. Amsterdam.
- Riemsdijk, Henk van (1978): *A Case Study in Syntactic Markedness*. Lisse.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1990): *Relativized Minimality*. Cambridge, Mass./London.

- Rosengren, Inger (1993): Wahlfreiheit mit Konsequenzen – Scrambling, Topikalisierung und FHG im Dienste der Informationsstrukturierung. In: Reis, M. (ed.): Wortstellung und Informationsstruktur. Tübingen. p. 251-312.
- Starke, Michal (this volume): Germanische und romanische Pronomina: stark – schwach – klitisch.
- Travis, Lisa (1984): Parameters and Effects of Word Order Variation. PhD diss., MIT.
- Travis, Lisa (1991): Parameters of Phrase Structure and V2 Phenomena. In: Fiengo, R. (ed.): Principles and Parameters in Comparative Grammar. Cambridge, Mass./London. p. 339-364.
- Vikner, Sten/Schwartz, Bonnie (forthcoming): The Verb Always Leaves IP in V2 Clauses. To appear in: Belletti, A./Rizzi, L. (eds.), Parameters and Functional Heads. Essays in Comparative Syntax. New York/Oxford.
- Wilder, Chris/Ćavar, Damir (1994): Word order variation, verb movement, and economy principles. In: *Studia Linguistica* 48, p. 46-86.
- Zwart, Jan-Wouter (1993): Dutch Syntax. A Minimalist Approach. PhD diss., Dept. of General Linguistics, Groningen University.
- Zwart, Jan-Wouter (1994): The Minimalist Program and German Syntax. A Reply to Gärtner and Steinbach. In: *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 54, p. 1-41.